

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 * * *

6 Ronald Collins,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 Nevada Department of Corrections, et al.,

10 Defendants.

11 Case No. 2:22-cv-01795-CDS-BNW

12 **ORDER**

13 Before the Court is a motion by Defendants Julie Williams, Joseph Swarts, Calvin
14 Johnson, Frank Dreesen, James Scally, William Oblak, Joseph Dugan, Jaymie Cabrera
(collectively “OAG Defendants”) to stay discovery. ECF No. 147. Plaintiff responded at ECF
15 No. 153. Defendant Henry joined the OAG Defendants’ request. ECF Nos. 155, 158.

16 Relatedly, Plaintiff filed a motion to extend deadlines or, in the alternative, stay discovery
17 as to OAG Defendants only. ECF No. 184.¹

18 **I. Motion to stay discovery as applied to OAG Defendants**

19 The basis for the OAG Defendants’ request for stay of discovery is based on the argument
20 that these defendants have qualified immunity. ECF No. 147. Plaintiff does not oppose a stay of
21 discovery as to the OAG Defendants but maintains that discovery should proceed with regard to
22 Defendant Henry—who is not subject to qualified immunity. Given this, the Court grants the
23 OAG Defendants’ motion at ECF No. 147 as unopposed under LR 7-2(d). The grant of ECF
24 No. 147 applies only to the OAG Defendants.

25
26
27
28 ¹ Given the Court will deny this motion as moot, a response is not needed.

1 **II. Defendant Henry's Joinder to Motion to Stay Discovery**

2 As discussed above, Plaintiff opposes a stay of discovery as to Defendant Henry. ECF No.
3 153. Defendant Henry argues discovery should not be *bifurcated* in this case but does not advance
4 any legal theories as to why discovery should be stayed as to her. ECF Nos. 155, 158. For this
5 reason, the Court will deny the request as to Defendant Henry without prejudice.

6 **III. Plaintiff's motion to extend deadlines**

7 As indicated above, Plaintiff's motion seeks to either extend deadlines *or* stay
8 discovery as to the OAG Defendants (only). Given the Court will stay discovery as to the OAG
9 Defendants, Plaintiff's request for an extension of deadlines is moot. The scheduling order at ECF
10 No. 145 remains in place as to Defendant Henry.

11 **IV. Conclusion**

12 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that OAG Defendants' motion to stay discovery (ECF
13 No. 147) is **GRANTED** as applied to the OAG Defendants.

14 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant Henry's request to stay discovery as to
15 Defendant Henry is **DENIED** without prejudice.

16 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion to extend deadlines (ECF No. 184)
17 is **DENIED** as moot.

18 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that OAG Defendants and Plaintiff must file a new
19 Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order fourteen days after the stay of discovery is lifted.

21 DATED: August 15, 2024

22 
23 BRENDA WEKSLER
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE